R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 791 AL 001 203

PROBLEMS OF THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL LANGUAGES--INTRODUCTION AND CONCLUSION. PRELIMINARY TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED WORKS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS, NUMBER 1.

BY- GUXMAN, M.M., ED.
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, WASHINGTON, D.C.
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE MAY 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.48 35P.

DESCRIPTORS- *OFFICIAL LANGUAGES, SOCIOLINGUISTICS, WRITTEN LANGUAGE, *LANGUAGE RESEARCH, NATIONAL PROGRAMS, ETHNIC GROUPS, CULTURAL AWARENESS, NATIONALISM, LANGUAGE USAGE,

THIS DOCUMENT COMPRISES THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE INTRODUCTION AND CONCLUSION TO A SELECTION OF WRITINGS COMPILED AND EDITED BY M.M. GUXMAN--"VOPROSY FORMIROVANIJA I RAZVITIJA NACIONAL'NYX JAZYKOV (PROBLEMS OF THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL LANGUAGES)," MOSCOW, 1960. GUXMAN'S VOLUME IS A COLLECTION OF DETAILED STUDIES OF LANGUAGES SUCH AS ARABIC, UZBEK, AND BASHKIR, WHICH HAVE UNDERGONE CERTAIN REGULAR PROCESSES IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT. THE STUDIES ILLUSTRATE--(1) THE INTERRELATION BETWEEN WRITTEN LITERARY AND COLLOQUIAL FOLK VARIETIES OF LANGUAGE, AND (2) THE PROCESS OF STANDARDIZATION AND FORMATION OF A COMMON NATIONAL LITERARY NORM. THE CHAPTERS SELECTED BY THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS FOR TRANSLATION ARE THOSE STUDIES WHICH ARE NEW OR ORGANIZED SO AS TO ILLUSTRATE GUXMAN'S POINTS PARTICULARLY WELL. (EXCLUDED ARE MATERIALS ALREADY WELL-KNOWN TO SCHOLARS IN THE UNITED STATES--ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, AND NETHERLANDIC.) THIS INTRODUCTION AND CONCLUSION WERE TRANSLATED BY ALFRED PIETRZYK OF THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS. (AMM)

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

ED018791

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

PRELIMINARY TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED WORKS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

M.M. GUXMAN (ed.) Voprosy formirovanija i razvitija nacional'nyx jazykov [Problems of the Formation and Development of National Languages], Moscow 1960.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Number I

This project was supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant NSF GS-325. The Center for Applied Linguistics reserves all rights applicable to these translations. Comments are invited and may be addressed to the Translators at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

May 1964

AL 001 203

Introduction

The Center for Applied Linguistics, since its inception in 1959, has been concerned with problems within the field of sociolinguistics. Among the more urgent problems in this field are those related to the language factor in the national development of new countries. In 1964, the Center therefore undertook the translation of a collection of studies edited by M.M. Guxman, Voprosy formirovanija i razvitija nacional'nyx jazykov [Problems of the Formation and Development of National Languages], Moscow, 1960. This collection contains detailed studies of languages such as Uzbek and Bashkir, which have undergone certain regular processes in their development. Originally, the Center had planned to publish these translations as a whole, however lack of funds and the inavailability of staff time make this impossible. Instead, it was decided to announce the availability of the items most relevant to American scholars through the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, and to enter the most important of these in the abstracts journal, Research in Education. The Center is grateful for the assistance of the following language specialists who edited the studies within their areas of specialization: Sirarpi Ohannessian (Armenian), Samuel Martin (Chinese and Japanese), Robert Di Pietro (Italian), Nicholas Poppe (Bashkir), Frank A. Rice (Arabic), Andrée S. Sjoberg (Uzbek).

The studies in this collection were selected from the complete set of preliminary translations of Chapters in M.M. Guxman's book, in consultation with specialists in the language areas represented. Guxman originally chose the materials in her book to illustrate two aspects of national language development: (a) the interrelation between written literary and colloquial folk varieties of a language and (b) the process of standardization and formation of a common national literary norm. Specifically excluded are the studies which contain material already well-known to scholars in the United States, namely those dealing with English, French, German and Netherlandic. The introduction and conclusion by Guxman, which have been combined, indicate how these studies fitted into the whole and the details of the development of these languages are well-known to American scholars. The remaining chapters were selected because the material in them was new or organized so as to illustrate Guxman's points particularly well. All the studies have been checked carefully with respect to translation accuracy and accuracy of linguistic data. Limited funds precluded a final complete editing for consistency of style and format as well as retyping of those which did not require extensive work on the part of the language specialists.

Kathleen Lewis

INTRODUCTION

[By M. M. Guxman]

[Guxman, Voprosy..., pp. 3-8. Translated by Alfred Pietrzyk, Center for Applied Linguistics.]

The study of regularities in the formation and development of national languages is of importance not only to linguistic theory, but also to linguistic practice. These matters are closely connected with the tasks involved in the creation and development of national literary languages. They therefore have an immediate relevance both here in the Soviet Union and abroad, especially in the East, in democratic China, in the United Arab Republic and other Arab states, as well as in countries with growing national liberation movements.

In Soviet linguistics, interest in the theoretical aspect of the problems under consideration has become especially intense since the linguistic debate of 1950. Numerous articles appeared that were devoted to general theoretical questions concerning the formation of national languages. There were first attempts to define the specific nature of national languages in comparison with folk languages; the content of the very notion of "national language" was specified in its coextension with such categories as "literary language," "literary norm," "common national norm," and "regional dialect." The most important questions relevant to this problem were outlined.

The shortcoming of the first efforts lay in their insufficiency of concrete material, and their mainly speculative, rather than specifically analytical nature. Later, there appeared a series of articles dealing with the study of the formation processes of separate national

AL 001 203

languages, including Russian, German, Uzbek, and Spanish.[1] The problems connected with the study of regularities in the formation and development of national languages crystallized into a more or less definite shape.[2] The specification of problems resulted from an analysis of development processes within individual languages; at the same time, however, a role of considerable importance was also played by theoretical discussions that were held from 1950 through 1953 concerning the very concept of "national language," for the purpose of shedding light on the distinctive properties that characterize the latter in comparison with a folk language.[3]

The controversy surrounding these questions occasionally took a somewhat scholastic form of reasoning: can one ascribe a new quality to national languages as compared with folk languages, or are the changes occurring in the process of national-language formation merely a matter of the "external side" of a language, and therefore incapable of affecting the qualitative characteristics of the latter? In spite of this, these discussions undoubtedly helped both the precise formulation of the concept of "national language," as well as the isolation of the salient characteristics of the latter's formation process.

Thus, the main features of the object under study were isolated, and attention was focused on some of the most important stages in the process of development from a folk language to a national language.

Nearly all of the earlier published articles and contributions devoted to the study of the formation and development of individual languages indicated that the concrete manifestations of this process depend on the specific characteristics of the development of a given

national language, and on the history of the people speaking a given language. It was evident, however, that among all historical phenomena peculiar to the formation of national languages in different countries there must also be common features characterizing this process--general regularities reflected in the historical peculiarities of the development of individual languages. Even the partial, incomplete elucidation of these general regularities is feasible only if one draws on comparative material from the histories of different national languages formed under different conditions. It is thus that the present contribution was conceived.

In order to implement the proposed task, material was drawn from the histories of Armenian, Uzbek, Bashkir, Albanian, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, English, German, Netherlandish, Italian, Spanish, and French.[4] Some of these languages had had a lengthy written literary tradition, even prior to the process of national-language formation. Others began only recently to develop their respective literary idioms: the English nation and national language had come into being as early as the 16th century, whereas the Bashkir nation and national language were formed only following the victory of the October Revolution. In France, the unity of the written literary language was established as early as the 13th century, i.e., long before the formation of the nation and national language, whereas in Germany this unity was achieved with difficulty in the 18th century. The formation of Eastern Slavic national languages had its peculiarities in connection with the protracted coexistence of two different written literary traditions--one "native," and the other "alien". In the Arab countries, the formation of national languages is taking place at the present time under conditions preserving the

authority of the classical written literary tradition--etc. In other words, in order to lay bare the regularities in the formation and development of national languages, languages were assembled which are characterized by diverse traditions and different stages of development, and which were formed under different historical conditions.

In this project, the study of general regularities in the formation and development of national languages concentrates on several cardinal questions. The selection of these questions was above all determined by the very concept of national language in its relationship to such categories as "literary language," "literary norm," and "regional dialect."

In the present project, a national language is viewed as a complex system of language types. This system includes not only a literary language with its oral and written varieties, but also colloquial folk speech, semi-dialects, urban vernaculars, and regional dialects. For the following reasons, it does not seem correct to identify the national language with the literary language of the period of national existence, or to use the term "national language" as a characteristic synonym for the terms "literary language" and "literary norm":[5] (1) beyond the confines of a national language, there are diverse forms of oral communication; on this basis, a literary language is set apart from various forms of oral communication with which it is, in reality, closely connected;[6] (2) in the early stages of the formation of bourgeois nations, a literary language is often used by restricted social groups, while the basic masses of the rural and urban population use dialects, semi-dialects, and urban vernaculars; thus, a national language is found to belong only to a part of a nation--a fact which contradicts the very concept of national language. Within any segment of the history of a language, a literary

language undoubtedly occupies a special place in the system of national language types. This does not mean, however, that the concepts under consideration are identical.

The interrelationship among the national language types enumerated above, as well as the character and significance of each, may vary not only when the phenomena of different languages are under comparison but also when different historical periods of the same national language are studied. During the stage of the existence of developed national languages, the literary language in its standarized form gradually displaces semi-dialects and dialects from both the written and spoken varieties of the language. Under these conditions, a literary language appears in both spoken and written communication as the representative of a common national norm--the highest form of existence of a national language. In the early developmental stages of such national languages, dialects and semi-dialects may have a much wider application, a literary language may prevail only in written varieties of a language, a consistently realized norm may not even be present, etc.

Even more striking is the interrelationship among national language types when the histories of different languages are compared. The presence or absence of several literary languages--"alien" and "native," classical and modern--the degree to which dialectal differentiation persists at the time of national language formation, the character of a literary language of the pre-national period, preservation of the old dialect base underlying a literary language, or a change of that base during the transition from a folk language to a national language--all of these factors directly affect the interrelationships among various language types.

The nature of a society's class structure exerts a special influence on all of these processes: the ways in which national languages develop in a socialist society and, on the other hand, under capitalism are not identical.

The foregoing conception of national language called for a study of the dynamics of interrelations between various types of a national language, to be included among the fundamental tasks of the present project--i.e., a study of the interrelations between a literary language in its written and oral varieties, and, on the other hand, dialects, semi-dialects, and urban vernaculars, in the process of the formation and development of national languages. [illegible] fundamental characteristic of a developed national language--in contradistinction to a folk language--is the presence of a single, standardized literary language (a common national literary norm[7]), which is commonly shared by the entire nation, which functions in all aspects of communication, and which was formed from a folk base. With this in view, an analysis of regularities in the formation of this type of literary language necessarily occupied a prominent place in the contributions included in this project.

Thus, in the included articles, light was shed on the following problems: elucidation of the dialect base underlying a common national literary norm; elucidation of the interrelation between the entire system of characteristics of the dialect which provided a base for the literary norm, and, on the other hand, the norm itself; studies of the interaction between a dialect and the preceding tradition of a written literary language("alien" and "native"), in the development of a common national norm; studies, within this process, of the interaction

between various dialects and various written literary traditions; the mutual relationship between the written and the spoken varieties of a national language, and, in this connection, the scope of the application of a literary language, dialect, or semi-dialect, during both the formation and the further development of a national language; specifics of the nature of the unity of a national language in comparison with a folk language.

These problems are elucidated by means of data from various languages, mainly in the first part of the present volume.

Closely connected with the problems of the first part are articles which explore the actual process of the development of a unified, common national norm, i.e., the essentials of standardization in the sphere of orthography, grammatical structure, lexical make-up, and, finally, pronunciation; the analysis of different principles governing the selection realized in the standardization process; within this process, the interrelationship between a simple solidification of established usage, and the tradition and regulatory activity of a normative agent (i.e., between a spontaneous process and an "artificial" standardization).

The diversity of the forms of language standardization depends on the specific historical epoch in which a given process is accomplished (cf. the type of standardization of the French language from the 16th through the 17th century in the article by M.S. Guryčeva, and the development of unified norms in the Bashkir language in the article by A. A. Juldašev); on the degree of unity in the literary language at the time when the standardization process begins to unfold (cf. the protracted coexistence of several varieties of the German literary language in the

article by M. M. Guxman, and of the Albanian language in the article by A. V. Desnitskaja); on the presence or absence of the continuity of a dialect base underlying a literary language of the pre-national and national period (see the article by S. A Mironov); on the presence or absence of two written literary languages at the time of national language formation (the article by T. B. Alisova with data from the Italian language); and on the total nature of the interrelationship between the literary language and the other types of a national language. Articles which mainly explore questions connected with these problems are included in the second part.

A highly complex problem arises in connection with the formation of national languages in countries in which an "alien" national, or even pre-national language came to be widely employed as a literary language, as a result of conquests or currents of migration. The simplest example of this process is the case of the Danish language in Norway where, during the nation's evolution, two literary languages and norms were formed--one with Norwegianized Danish as its base, and the other from a local folk base. Considerably more complex is the problem of the Spanish language in South America (the article by G. V. Stepanov). Also relevant to the problems under discussion is the question of the old Arabic language in countries of the Arab East (the article by V. M. Belkin).

The distribution of articles over the two parts is conditional in some cases. Thus, the article (by V. N. Jartseva) about the change of the dialect base underlying the English literary language belongs unquestionably to the first part, whereas the article (by M. S. Guryčeva) exploring the standardization process of the French language during the

16th and 17th centuries must be included in the second part. However, the articles (by N. I. Konrad) about the Chinese and Japanese languages, and (by S. A. Mironov and A. S. Garibjan) about the Netherlandish and Armenian languages, which belong to the first part, at the same time shed light on the process of the development of a unified literary norm.

In the study of the formation processes of separate languages, the selection of problems was to a considerable degree determined by the extent to which a language can be studied, and also by the distinctiveness of the formation process of a given national language. Thus, for example, in the history of the French language, the dialect base of the written literary language had assumed a definite shape even in the 13th century and was subsequently not subjected to any change; the well-known unity of that literary language had thus come about prior to the national period. The following was characteristic in the formation of the French national language: (1) displacement of an alien literary language--Latin--from such pursuits of public life as science and law, and (2) establishment of a distinct grammatical and lexical norm. These processes are explored in the article by M. S. Guryčeva. However, in connection with the process of national language formation in countries of the Arab East, the interrelationship between the classical written literary language and the new colloquial folk languages constitutes the most essential and complex problem--etc.

The results of a comparative analysis of items taken from different languages and investigated in separate articles served as the basis for a conclusion which attempts to outline some general features in the process of the formation and development of national languages. - M. M. Guxman.

[FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION]

---

1. See the articles by V. V Vinogradov, R. I. Avanesov, and V. G. Orlova on the Russian language, by M. M. Guxman on the German language, by A. F. Sultanov on the Arabic language in Egypt, by V. V. Rešetov on the Uzbek language, and by G. V. Stepanov on the Spanish language.

2. See, for example, R. I. Avanesov, "On Problems of the Formation of the Russian National Language" [in Russ.], Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 2 (1953); V. V. Vinogradov, "Problems of the Formation of the Russian National Language" [in Russ.], Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 1 (1956); A. F. Sultanov, "The Problem of the Formation of a National Language in Egypt" [in Russ.], Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 6 (1955); M. M. Guxman, From a German Folk Language to a German National Language [in Russ.], Part I, Moscow, 1955; Part II, 1959.

3. Cf., for example, V. I. Panov, "On the Differences between a National Language and a Folk Language" [in Russ.], Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 6 (1952); V. G. Orlova, "Changes in the Character of Language Development in Connection with a People's History" [in Russ.], Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 1 (1953), as well as the editorial article published in the latter issue.

4. Similar articles, based on materials from the history of the Russian and other Slavic languages, are planned for publication in a separate collection.

5. Such an interpretation of the concept of national language was

encountered in the writings of certain Soviet and foreign authors.

6. A literary norm often develops from an underlying, well-defined urban semi-dialect, or from a somewhat modified form of the dialect used throughout the territory in which a country's political center is situated; cf., in this connection, the articles by N. I Konrad, V. N. Jartseva, and V. V. Rešetov included in the present project. One is struck by the ease with which phenomena from other dialects penetrate into a literary language in the early stages of the development of a national language, and by the phenomenon of the penetration of literary elements into dialect speech at later stages.

7. A folk language may under various historical conditions include a relatively unified written literary language (cf., for example, the case of France), but the latter does not have the norm characteristic of national literary languages--not even in situations of written communication. Another distinctive feature of written literary languages of the folk variety is the restriction of their scope of application.

CONCLUSION: SOME GENERAL REGULARITIES IN THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL LANGUAGES[1]

[By M. M. Guxman]

[Guxman, Voprosy..., pp. 295-307. Translated by Philip Dorff, Center for Applied Linguistics.]

1

As the collated material has shown, the main features distinguishing a national language from a folk language are not to be sought primarily in the structural characteristics of a language but in the qualitative change in the relationships of its different types, and in the change in the functional character of each of these types. This concerns the literary language first and foremost. The formation of national literary languages is, to a certain extent, in process as early as the pre-national period, inasmuch as written literary languages are to be found even during the stage of folk existence. However, the literary language of the national formation stage gradually accumulates a series of qualitative peculiarities which distinguish it from the literary language of the preceding historical period.

In those countries (such as China, Japan,[2] or Armenia[3]), where a developed written literary language was present as early as the feudal stage, a new literary language was formed on the basis of the dialect of the territory in which the leading political and economic center of the country was located. The qualitative distinction of the new literary language was above all expressed by its different functional character: if

the medieval literary language was utilized by comparatively restricted social classes and only in its written variety, the national literary language gradually acquired a significance that was almost nation-wide and was applied in written and oral communication. In China, pai-hua (as only the vernacular was originally called as distinct from the classical written wen-yen), after it had become the state language - kuo-yü - became the carrier of the common national language norm. It is especially important that a new literary language exists in its written and oral varieties in China, while the very transfer of the term pai-hua to the new literary language seems to underscore the unity of the language sphere of the written literary and colloquial folk varieties of the national language.

Processes of the same type may be observed in Japan. The new literary language (called hyōjungo 'normative language,' or 'standard language') became the common national language norm which dominated written and oral communication.

Of a somewhat different content are the processes which caused the formation of new literary language characteristics during the national formation and development stage in those countries where there existed a written literary language with a foreign base in the pre-capitalistic period: in Russia - Old Church Slavic, in Germany, France and Italy - Latin, in Norway - Danish, although the characteristics of the national literary language as distinct from the literary language of the preceding period remain essentially the same as those of China and Japan. Latin functioned as the written literary language in Germany for many years: it dominated all the prose genres of writing until the fourteenth century.

The German literary language was used primarily in poetry.[4] This created a special gap between the written-literary and colloquial-folk language types of the German people. Thus, the first task in the national formation stage was the banishment of Latin from all spheres of communication. This task was not realized at once: commercial writing won out at first, then the church, and, last of all, science. The protracted dominance of a written-literary language with a "foreign" base, especially in school, not only promoted the flourishing of dialects in the colloquial-folk variety of German, but in time of extreme political and economic crisis made for the presence of several, very diverse, varieties of literary language based on German. The question was raised about effecting unity in the German literary language and overcoming regional separatism. This unity was established during the formation and development period of the German nation, first in the written, then in the oral varieties of the national language.[5] The difference between the German national literary language and the literary language of the German people consisted primarily in the fact that only during the formation and development period of the German nation did the German literary language dominate all spheres of communication and appear as the carrier of a united common national norm.

The formation of the French national language assumed a similar, although somewhat different, form.[6] Here, also, in the national language formation period, the French literary language gradually forced Latin out of all spheres of communication and here, also, extensive work was conducted in the formation of the lexical, grammatical, and orthoepic norms which operated in the oral and written varieties of the language. But inasmuch as a certain unity was established within the bounds of the written-literary

varieties of the language as early as the pre-national period in France, the task of overcoming regional separatism was here of considerably less significance.

In Italy, however, where the developing national literary language had to fight both the protracted domination of Latin and regional separatism, the final formation of Italian literary language unity and the bridging of the gap between the written-literary and colloquial-folk varieties of the language were delayed by the restrained development of economic and political centralization, as well as foreign dominance.[7] Here too, however, as in China and Japan, as in Germany and France, the same tasks arose in the formation of the Italian national literary language.

The gradual penetration of the literary language into all spheres of communication, including the vernacular, the formation of unified grammatical, lexical, and orthoepic norms, a striving to liquidate the gap between the written-literary and colloquial-folk varieties of the language which existed earlier in many countries, and the assimilation of the styles of these two varieties - these are what characterize the formation and development period of national languages in all countries. The concrete forms in which these processes are realized, the intensity of development, and the role of the individual links do differ, but even in the formation process of the new written Bashkir national language,[8] the problem of working out a unified, supradialectal literary norm, operative in the written as well as the oral varieties of the national language was in the twentieth century just as real as it was in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Germany or Italy.

Typical of a national literary language is its functioning in the

capacity of a unified and single literary language, used both in oral as well as in written communication. The extent to which the gap between the written-literary and colloquial-folk varieties of a language is felt as an obstacle to the development of national culture and as an obstacle on a given people's road to progress, is shown not only by materials drawn from the histories of the Chinese and Japanese national languages,[9] but also by the contemporary state of affairs in countries of the Arab East,[10] and by the difficulties of language development in South America[11].

In several cases, however, as the material indicates, two different varieties of a literary language are preserved in the period of national language formation and development. The Norwegian, Albanian, and Armenian languages may serve as examples.

In Norway, as is known, the written literary language was formed on a Danish base as early as the pre-national period. Gradually, the oral variety of this language crystallized through interaction with the urban semi-dialect of Oslo. Thus, a literary language based on a foreign (although closely related) speech form - "bokmål" - was used in oral as well as written communication. Ibsen and Björnson wrote in this language. But demands were raised in the nineteenth century in favor of creating an indigenous literary language based on the Norwegian "landsmål". Both languages perform one and the same function in Modern Norwegian, both are state languages used in artistic literature, journalism, teaching, and in oral communication; bokmål is used primarily in the east of the country, landsmål in the west. A similarity of grammatical structure, and a sufficient community of lexical items makes the parallel use of both languages possible. The repeated writing reforms also brought together the ortho-

graphic rules characteristic of either language. The interaction of these two languages is beyond doubt. Nevertheless, even today, such a unified literary language as characterizes other nations is not to be found in Norway.

In Albania there are two varieties of literary language based on Albanian; one of them is based on the southern (Tosk) dialect, the other on the northern (Gheg) dialect. In the course of many years, both these dialects developed in a parallel fashion, but in constant interaction with one another. This is explained by the specific historical circumstances of Albania. After the victory of the Albanian people in the people's war for liberation, the southern variety began to predominate considerably and, as A. V. Desnickaja suggests, "possessed all the elements necessary to become the common Albanian literary language."[12] However, even at the present time, a significant portion of artistic and political literature continues to be published in the northern variety of the literary language.

There are also two varieties in Modern Armenian which developed under entirely different historical circumstances. One of them, the eastern variety, became the main state language of socialist Armenia after the October Socialist Revolution and received every opportunity for further development. The second, the western, is the language of that portion of the Armenian people which is found abroad.

The coexistence of two literary languages was, in the first case, caused by the protracted membership of Norway in the realm of the Danish Kingdom. In the second case, the coexistence of two varieties of the literary language was the result of the protracted geographical, economic,

and cultural divergence of the south and north of Albania, and of a foreign dominance which delayed the consolidation of the Albanian nation. Finally, the presence of two varieties of the Armenian language is connected with the age-old divergence of the Armenian people, divested in the past of a common territory and having therefore several cultural centers.[13]

For the Albanian language, this condition is apparently temporary, transitory. To predict the paths of development of the Norwegian and Armenian national languages would be difficult at the present time. It was noted above that during the period of national existence a literary language usually acts as the carrier of the common national norm; in fact, the literary language is called upon under such circumstances to represent the language unity of a given people and to perform the function of a common national language. This completely changes the role of the other types of the language. The introduction of mandatory elementary education in many countries still in the capitalist stage, especially the rapid tempo of the cultural revolution in those countries where socialism has been victorious, promoted the appearance of a literary language in those spheres of communication which were formerly dominated by a dialect. The press, radio, and motion pictures constitute channels for a unified literary norm. This process is most intensive in socialist countries where the common national role of the literary language is fully realized.

Doubtless, the speed at which other language types are displaced by the literary language varies in different countries depending on the length of existence of both the nation and the unified literary language, on the totality of historical circumstances according to which different nations are formed, on a nation's culture in general, and its literature

and language in particular. However, a general feature of national language development is the ever-growing intensity in the appearance of a literary norm in all forms of communication. For example, although the semi-dialect is still retained in oral communication in the cities of Italy and Germany, and regional dialects still retain their force in rural localities, the establishment of a unified norm and the continuous advance of the literary language on the dialect in oral communication, beginning (for example) as early as the end of the eighteenth century in Germany and in the nineteenth century in Italy, signify nevertheless an ever greater decrease in the social function of the dialect. The leading role of the literary language and the subordinate status of regional dialects is being more and more clearly defined. According to N. I. Konrad, in China and Japan it is not at all the case that everyone has a command of the common literary language - not only in rural communities but also in cities. The dialect is here, too, used in oral communication, but a progressive tendency towards its disappearance is also apparent.

In England and France the process of dialect disappearance from all spheres of communication went considerably farther. In France, in particular, the urban semi-dialect no longer plays the role it does in Germany and Italy.

In feudal times, the written variety of a literary language predominated, while, with a weak distribution of literacy, the literary language was only the property of relatively limited social circles. However, a new type of national literary language is increasingly winning over the broad masses of the people - especially in socialist countries - and is assuming a common national significance. Thus, in the stage of national existence, the character of the language unity is in fact changed. It is not to be denied that each language represents a unified system in each stage of its development, in the sense that all the types of the given language are only its modifications. In spite of dialect

differentiation and the presence of a written literary language with a "foreign" base, the German and Italian languages (in the 14th and 15th centuries, for example) were perceived as a certain unity as opposed to Latin. The same is true of any language. However, not one of the language types in the feudal period functioned in the capacity of the carrier of this language unity in all spheres of communication and in various social groups.

In the colloquial variety of a folk language, there is a dominance of either a regional dialect, of modified forms of semi-dialects, or a koiné peculiar to a region. Although the local dialects in several countries were of the broadest social scope in the feudal period, not being limited by any social groups, they can in no respect lay claim to a common national character, for every local dialect is used only in one part of the territory of a given people.

3

Inasmuch as the main link in national language formation and development is the process of establishing a new type of literary language, the determination of several general features of this process is very essential.

Doubtless, a general characteristic is the completely conscious normalization of a literary language, the role of which may not be uniform in the formation and development of different national languages. It depends to a significant degree upon the interrelationship between the national literary language and the literary language of the pre-national period (whether this literary language is new, as in China and Japan, or only the modified old literary language as in France; whether the dialect base was preserved, as in France, or whether it changed, as in Holland; whether the pre-national literary language constituted a known unity, as

in France, or whether it existed in the form of several varieties of the literary language, as in Germany, etc.). Nowhere, however, did the formation and development of national languages take place without the codification of a system of lexical, grammatical, orthoepic, and orthographic norms.

Literature exercizes a tremendous influence on the formation of a national language and its literary norm. In Russia, the creative work of the writers and poets of the pre-Pushkin era paved the way for the flowering of a new type of literary language, but only Pushkin, and such of his contemporaries as Lermontov and Gogol, gave final form to that new type of literary language, which became as a result expressive of the common national norm. In China and Japan, the struggle for a literary language of a new type was contemporary with the struggle for a new method and content in literature. In China, Lu-Sin, and in Japan, Shimazaki Toson, fixed these new literary language norms in their creative work. In Germany, the establishment of a unified literary language is connected with the creative work of Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, and later Heine; in France, Corneille, Racine, and Molière, were to the same degree creators of a national literary language as Shakespeare in England.

In this regard, one should not separate the formation of a literary language from the activity of normative theoreticians, from the creation of normative grammars and first dictionaries, or from the activity of language societies, academies, etc. The negative sides of this normalization in the history of individual languages are widely known: the limited class character of the demands of Vaugelas in France and Gottsched in Germany was noted, the "wet feet" of Šiškov and the puristic strivings of the

German normalizers of the 17th and 18th centuries were ridiculed, the striving of many normalizers both in Western as well as Eastern countries to counteract the appearance of the new vital tendencies of the colloquial variety of the language was underscored. But all these negative facts, several separate examples of which we also find in the early normative practices of our Soviet period, by no means detract from the significance of normalization itself in the process of establishing national language unity.

The direction of the normative process and the forms it assumes are different in different historical circumstances. In Socialist countries, where the establishment of orthographic, lexical, and grammatical norms is inextricably connected with the development of the general culture of the people, and with the familiarization of the broadest masses of the people with the achievements of science, literature, and art, this process assumes a national character. It is possible in this regard to refer to the establishment of the contemporary orthographic rules of the Russian language, to the discussion in China of various projects for adopting the Latin alphabet, to work on the perfection of alphabets and orthographic norms in the various Union Republics, etc. Questions, connected with the establishment of a new terminology in Armenian, Georgian, Azerbaijani, Lithuanian, and other languages, bear a direct relation to the establishment of a lexical norm in these national literary languages.

The normalization of the language in 16th- and 17th-century Italy or France was of interest, undoubtedly, to a relatively narrow social stratum. It was confined to a class also because the normalizers often proceeded from the language usage not of the broad masses of the people, but of the few layers close to the court (cf. the activity of Vaugelas in

France and especially the activity of Gottsched in Germany). Sometimes connected with this was propaganda cast in a pretentious style, with words and expressions foreign to the native colloquial speech, i.e., a striving to tear the literary norm away from the use of the native colloquial language. These tendencies characterized, for example, certain historical periods in the activity of the French Academy.[14]

Consequently, the specific content of one or another of the norms which arose during the process of the development of various literary languages, depended upon the totality of historical circumstances in the development of a given literary language, and also upon the circumstances of those social relations under which the normalization was conducted. However, in order to establish general regularities in national language formation and development, it is essential to maintain the position that the formation of a new type of literary language, expressive of a common national unity, is impossible without conscious normalization, without theoretical comprehension of the norm and codification of definite rules of pronunciation, usage, and inflection. The literary language of any period has elements of choice, but in the time of national language formation and development this choice becomes especially relevant, and the striving towards language unity imparts to the developing norm a common national character. In this connection, the common national norm embodied in the literary language is never the result of a spontaneous process of language development, but to a certain degree the result of artificial selection and "interference" with this spontaneous process.

4

One of the fundamental theoretical questions concerning the study of the process of national language formation and development, is the inter-relationship between the literary or written literary tradition and the various manifestations of the colloquial variety of a language.

This problem has several aspects. The first of these is the question concerning the dialect base or foundation of a literary language. In the articles published in the present collection, this question was applied to the material of a series of languages. In fact, all the articles of the first section concerned this question in one degree or another.

The common national norm which crystallizes in a literary language is connected, no doubt, with one or another dialect region, but this connection may assume different forms. Thus, for example, the Eastern Middle German dialects are generally considered the foundation of the German literary language. It is also customary to claim that the norm of the Dutch national language was formed on the base provided by the dialect of the province of Holland,[15] etc. It is often mentioned that the main literary norm is the urban vernacular of the capital: of London -- in England,[16] of Tashkent -- in Uzbekistan,[17] of Peking -- in China, of Tokyo -- in Japan,[18] etc.

However, as material taken from the histories of various languages shows, the formation process of the literary norm of a national language is so complex, the regularities of this process so specific in comparison with the life of a regional dialect, and the forms of combination in this

process of peculiarities of the colloquial speech of any one territory with the peculiarities of various intersecting traditions of the literary language so multifarious, that the literary norm is never in fact the simple codification of a system of dialect characteristics of any one region.[19]

Attention is directed to this by the various authors in their articles (S. A. Mironov, N. I. Konrad, and others). Examining the dialect base of such literary languages as Chinese and Japanese, N. I. Konrad underscores the role of regional koinés representing the result of a significant divergence from narrow dialect characteristics. The divergence from a narrow dialect base, the combination of various dialect characteristics, the influence to this or that degree of various written literary traditions are characteristic of virtually every literary language. In Germany, the literary norm of the national language is by no means a dodification of the system of characteristics of the Eastern Middle German dialects, generally considered to be the basis of literary German. Practically none of the specific pronuniciation peculiarities of this region were reflected in the orthoepic norm of the German literary language. This norm appeared as the result of a long process of interaction between the dialects of the Middle and Lower German regions, on the one hand, and an artificial regulation, on the other.[20]

With respect to the morphological and syntactic, and even more, to the lexical norms, the modern literary language is not only very far from the Eastern Middle German dialects, but also from the Leipzig vernacular, which represents a distinctive semi-dialect. As the analysis of the material shows, the main literary norm was the Eastern Middle German variety of the literary language of the 14th and 15th centuries (of the

pre-national stage), formed as the result of the interaction of a regional koiné and various written literary traditions.

In the Dutch language, where a change in the dialect base and re-orientation towards the colloquial speech of the province of Holland took place during the formation process of the national language, the contemporary norm of the literary language in the realm of orthoepy, grammar, and vocabulary, significantly differs from the dialect of this region. Here, especially in its written form, the literary tradition of the literary language of the pre-national period, connected with another dialect region,[21] expressed itself very strongly.

In the two varieties of the Armenian literary language, researchers[22] note not only the reflection of the interaction between different dialect currents, but also the influence of the classical written Grabar upon the formation of contemporary literary norms.

Thus, the complex interaction of regional colloquial speech (of a dialect, of a semi-dialect, of the urban vernacular) and the former tradition of the written literary language is characteristic of the formation process of the literary norm of many languages which developed under dissimilar conditions.

There are, no doubt, also those conditions under which the process reveals somewhat different tendencies. Thus, for example, in the case of an intensive repulsion from the tradition of the classical written language, as is so clearly observable in China and Japan, the influence of the old literary tradition upon the new literary language, formed on a colloquial base, assumes special forms. It may almost be absent in the formation of the literary norm of newly literate languages such as, for example, the

Bashkir national language[23]. A definitive role in the interrelationship between the written tradition and the colloquial dialect base is played by the history of a written language in the pre-national stage, as well as by its interrelationship with various forms of colloquial speech.

However, under all circumstances, the literary norm of the national language always represents the result of a certain isolation from its dialect base. This is above all connected with peculiarities of the social functions of a literary language. Not only do marked dialect elements remain foreign to it during all the stages of literary language existence but, in the literary language itself vocabulary layers are created, and syntactic peculiarities developed, which never existed in the dialect base. This isolation of a literary language from a dialect base assumes special forms in the period of national language formation and development.

If the approximation of the functional styles of the written literary and colloquial varieties of a national language may be noted as a general tendency in the development of national languages, the interrelationship of these two varieties during the formation process and early stages in the development of national languages are very different.

Beginning with the 13th century in France, a relatively unified written literary language was formed, forcing out other written literary varieties. The edict of Francis I (in 1539) concerning the introduction of French instead of Latin into legal procedure was also directed against the use of local dialects in official practice. It is a known fact that the French normalizers of the 15th and 16th centuries oriented themselves towards the language of Paris, but towards the form in which it was spoken

at court. Even then, the rather significant gap between the literary language and the colloquial language of the people -- of the inhabitants of Paris -- had come to light. In the other regions of France, regional dialects dominated oral communication. It is characteristic that during the French Revolution special attention was directed to the extension of a unified language over all of the French territory, on the one hand, and significant efforts were directed towards the democratization of the literary language, on the other. However, the distinct opposition of the literary language (preserving to a certain degree the traditions of French classical literature) to the colloquial language of not only the rural but the urban population is still observable in the 20th century in spite of limited dialect use. And even in the 20th century, a series of French linguists, first and foremost Dauzat, spoke out against the appearance of new vernacular vocabulary and colloquial constructions in the literary language. The controversy surrounding the conservatism of the French literary language, its simplification, the appearance of colloquial and folk speech elements in the literary language, became especially intense beginning with the period of the First World War and led to an even greater approximation of the literary variety to the colloquial folk variety of the language.

In China and Japan, where the contemporary literary norm is being created in the process of transforming the colloquial folk language into the literary language, where even the very name pai-hua (cf. N. I. Konrad's article) points up the connection between the literary language and the colloquial folk variety of the language, the gap between the old written and the colloquial language, which was formed here in the preceding century,

is being liquidated in the process of national language formation.

In Germany, the establishment of a common national norm is above all connected with the written literary form of the language. The domination of dialects and regional koinés in the colloquial variety of the language furthered the opposition of the written form of the literary language (Schriftsprache) to the oral forms of the language and conditioned to a certain degree the conservatism of the syntax and phrase patterns of the literary language. However, a strong tendency towards the unification of these two spheres of German language application is observed in progressive writers of the last few decades.

The concrete historical circumstances, the period in which the foundations for a national literary language were laid, the degree of dialect persistence and, above all, the character of the language relationships of the pre-national period in this or that country, conditioned the nature of that general process of written literary and colloquial folk variety unification, which is characteristic of the period of national language formation and development. However, even here the definitive role of literary language social functions must be borne in mind. The wider the social sphere of literary language application, the more the broad social layers begin to use a literary language, the more intensive becomes the process of unifying both national language varieties. The democratization of all national culture is the basis of such a process.

5

As was shown in the individual articles and especially noted in the conclusion, a national language differs from a folk language with respect to the

fundamental character of the interrelationship between the various language types. The main feature of a system of language types is the creation of a common national norm; the carrier of this norm in any country is the literary language which first appears with such a function. The formation of such a type of literary language indicates moreover a transformation of the interrelationship between the individual elements of a general system of language types and influences the character of the unity of the language.

These processes are by no means something external in relation to the structure of a language. To a significant degree, the changes in the structural elements and the very formation of new features in the structure of the literary language are connected with its transformation as a result of normalization and conscious selection.

The concrete content of a norm is directly related to a defined language structure, outside of which it does not exist. The elements of contemporary literary languages, heterogeneous in origin, are united and related in a unified system as a result of those processes of selection and normalization which are connected with national language formation. Consequently, the changes thus brought about in the system of language types also influenced a change in the structure of the literary language. Indeed, if in the course of the struggle between competing varieties of, for example, the German literary language, the Eastern Middle German variety had not won out, the system of structural elements of the literary language would have been different; together with this, the establishment of a supradialectal type of language, the crystallization of unified norms, changed the very nature and quality of the literary language.

We are not talking about any external signs, but about the very

essence of the phenomenon under study. Characteristics which are vital to the establishment of a national language may be accompanied by different changes in separate aspects of a language, for example, in the realm of syntax or vocabulary. These changes are connected with the formation of national culture. The development of a compound-subordinate complex and the formation of syntactic norms characteristic of a contemporary language, take place in many languages to a significant degree in connection with the development of scientific prose and journalism; the development and complication of functional styles characteristic of that period is conditioned by the flourishing of national literatures; but the system of functional styles of a literary language changes also in connection with the change in the relationship between the written literary and colloquial folk varieties of the language. Finally, the development of the vocabulary of national literary languages is conditioned in turn by the entire development of the given society. Thus, the "external" and the "internal" factors are interwoven in a complex fashion during the process of national language formation and development. -- (M. M. Guxman.)

[FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION]

---

1. The conclusion was written not only on the basis of the articles included in the present collection, but also on the basis of other materials published earlier in various periodicals.

2. Cf. N. I. Konrad's article "The Literary Language in China and Japan" in the present collection.

3. Cf. A. S. Garibjan's article "The Armenian National Literary Language" in the present collection.

4. The first significant prose works of religious content, as well as fictional prose in literary German, appeared in the thirteenth century.

5. Cf. M. M. Guxman's article "Formation of the Literary Norm of the German National Language" in the present collection.

6. Cf. M. S. Guryčeva's article "The Initial Stage in the Formation of the French National Language" in the present collection.

7. Cf. T. B. Alisova's article "Peculiarities in the Formation of Norms of the Italian Written Literary Language in the 16th Century" in the present collection.

8. Cf. A. A. Juldaševʼs article "Problems of the Formation of Unified Norms in the Bashkir National Language" in the present collection.

9. Cf. N. I. Konrad's article "The Literary Language in China and Japan".

10. Cf. V. M. Belkin's article "The Problem of Literary Language and Dialect in Arab Countries", published in the present collection, as well as A. F. Sultanov's article on the formation of the national language in Egypt mentioned above.

11. Cf. G. V. Stepanov's article "The National Language in Latin American Countries" in the present collection.

12. Cf. A. V. Desnitskaja's article "From the History of the Formation of the Albanian National Language", page 223 [Voprosy ...].

13. Cf. A. S. Garibjan's article "The Armenian National Literary Language".

14. Cf. R. A. Budagov's "The Concept of a Literary Language Norm in 16th and 17th Century France", Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 5, 1956.

15. Cf. S. A. Mironov's article "The Dialect Base Underlying the Literary Norm of the Netherlandish National Language" in the present collection.

16. Cf. V. N. Jartseva's "The Change of the Dialect Base of the English National Literary Language" in the present collection.

17. Cf. V. V. Rešetov's article "The Uzbek National Language" in the present collection.

18. Cf. N. I. Konrad's article "The Literary Language in China and Japan".

19. Urbančik [= Urbańczyk] has specially written on the complexity of the formation process of, for example, the Polish language (St. Urbańczyk "Note on the Origin of the Polish Literary Language" [in Polish], Pochodzenie polskiego jezyka literackiego [The Origin of the Polish Literary Language], Wrocław, 1956, pp. 82-101).

20. Cf. M. M. Guxman's article "Formation of the Literary Norm of the German Literary Language".

21. Cf. S. A. Mironov's "The Dialect Base Underlying the Literary Norm of the Netherlandish National Language".

22. Cf. A. S. Garibjan's "The Armenian National Literary Language".

23. Cf. A. A. Julďašev's "Problems of the Formation of Unified Norms in the Bashkir National Language".